

C.10 SOCIOECONOMICS, PUBLIC SERVICES, AND UTILITIES

This section addresses the environmental setting and impacts for socioeconomics, public services, and utilities associated with construction and operation of the proposed project and alternatives. Sections C.10.1 and C.10.2 address the proposed project, and Sections C.10.3 through C.10.10 address the alternative route segments and the No Project Alternative. This section also includes a study of the potential impact of the proposed pipeline on residential property values (Section C.10.2.5.5).

C.10.1 ENVIRONMENTAL BASELINE AND REGULATORY SETTING

The socioeconomics, public services, and utilities discussions in this section present the environmental baseline and provide a summary of the regulatory environment for these topics as they relate to the construction and operation of the proposed project and alternatives.

C.10.1.1 Environmental Setting

The study area for socioeconomics, public services, and utilities includes the Cities of Carson, Long Beach, Paramount, Bellflower, Cerritos, Artesia, Norwalk, and the Rancho Dominguez area of unincorporated Los Angeles County.

C.10.1.1.1 Socioeconomics

Population. Table C.10-1 presents the total 1990 and 1996 population; aggregate area, in square miles; and population density of the jurisdictions traversed by the proposed project and alternative routes. Population densities were derived by dividing population figures by the area in square miles.

Table C.10-1 Baseline Population and Area

Jurisdiction	Area (Sq. Mi.)	1990		1996	
		Population ¹	Pop. Density	Population ²	Pop. Density
Carson	18.8	87,113	4,634	88,100	4,686
Long Beach	50	438,771	8,775	433,200	8,664
Paramount	4.7	49,967	10,631	53,200	11,319
Bellflower	6.1	64,503	10,574	65,300	10,705
Cerritos	8.6	53,527	6,224	55,300	6,430
Artesia	1.62	15,464	9,546	16,400	10,123
Norwalk	9.8	97,767	9,976	99,800	10,184
Los Angeles County	4,060	9,053,645	2,230	9,237,500	2,275

Source: ¹Census, 1994, ²CDOF, 1996

Housing. Housing in the region includes single family dwellings, apartments, condominiums, and mobile homes. Table C.10-2 presents housing data for the jurisdictions traversed by the proposed project and alternative routes.

Table C.10-2 Baseline Housing Data

Jurisdiction	Total Units	Vacant	Vacancy Rate (%)
Carson	24,441	663	2.7
Long Beach	170,388	11,413	6.7
Paramount	13,726	733	5.3
Bellflower	24,117	1,212	5
Cerritos	15,364	338	2.2
Artesia	4,534	140	3.1
Norwalk	27,247	901	3.3
Los Angeles County	3,163,343	173,983	5.5

Source: Census, 1994

Employment. Table C.10-3 provides employment data for the jurisdictions traversed by the proposed project and alternative routes. Table C.10-3a provides forecasts of population, housing, and employment for the study area.

Table C.10-3 Labor Force and Unemployment

Jurisdiction	Total Labor Force	Total Unemployed	Unemployment Rate (%)
Carson	44,252	3,186	7.2
Long Beach	211,638	14,603	6.9
Paramount	21,774	2,156	9.9
Bellflower	32,260	1,903	5.9
Cerritos	29,106	1,077	3.7
Artesia	7,317	485	6.6
Norwalk	45,376	3,040	6.7
Los Angeles County	4,503,000	362,000	8

Source: Census, 1994

C.10.1.1.2 Businesses in the Immediate Vicinity of the Pipeline

During the public scoping period for this EIR, a number of businesses (e.g., Ford West and Don-A-Vee Jeep-Eagle, Inc. in Bellflower) located along the proposed pipeline route expressed concerns about the project's impacts on their businesses. Construction of the pipeline could affect businesses in the immediate vicinity of the project in a variety of ways. Issues of concern to business operations include traffic, air quality, noise, safety, and utility disruptions and are discussed in separate sections of this document. The analysis of socioeconomic impacts of the proposed project includes a qualitative assessment of the impacts

Table C.10-3a Population, Housing, and Employment Forecasts

Jurisdiction	Year:	2000	2005	2010	2015	2020
Population						
Carson		91,970	94,079	95,893	98,565	101,893
Long Beach		459,168	475,259	487,288	507,386	531,148
Paramount		54,817	56,082	57,028	58,608	60,475
Bellflower		66,740	68,440	69,712	71,836	74,348
Cerritos		55,618	56,504	57,167	58,274	59,583
Artesia		16,780	17,198	17,510	18,033	18,652
Norwalk		103,026	106,364	108,858	113,027	117,954
Los Angeles County		1,125,131	1,225,106	1,328,562	1,447,490	1,585,609
Housing (Number of Units)						
Carson		24,439	24,803	25,361	25,918	26,880
Long Beach		159,812	161,364	163,750	166,592	172,283
Paramount		14,175	14,250	14,363	14,497	14,768
Bellflower		23,512	23,896	24,486	25,188	26,595
Cerritos		15,310	15,488	15,763	16,091	16,747
Artesia ¹		Not Available	Not Available	5,905	Not Available	Not Available
Norwalk		27,166	27,657	28,411	29,310	31,109
Los Angeles County		305,104	333,208	378,559	429,665	487,657
Employment (Number of Jobs)						
Carson		62,060	67,288	71,388	75,825	81,343
Long Beach		193,894	209,183	229,255	240,942	252,948
Paramount		19,113	19,541	20,102	20,430	20,766
Bellflower		16,370	18,026	20,202	21,468	22,769
Cerritos		30,352	32,235	34,706	36,144	37,622
Artesia		8,221	8,742	9,425	9,823	10,232
Norwalk		21,492	22,669	24,213	25,112	26,036
Los Angeles County		300,127	344,157	399,052	450,538	503,290

Source: SCAG DEIR Comment Letter, March 13, 1998.

¹ Artesia General Plan, 1993.

on businesses along the pipeline route. This assessment does not identify individual business operations by type (e.g., an office building, retail store, or manufacturing plant) located in the vicinity of the pipeline. Rather, this assessment assembles information from other environmental impact issue areas concerning the ways in which businesses within the commercial and industrial land use categories would be affected by construction activities of the proposed project.

The pipeline would be placed almost entirely within existing streets as the project area is highly urbanized. Given this highly urbanized nature of the study area, there are numerous commercial, and heavy and light industrial land uses located in the immediate vicinity of the proposed project and alternative routes that could be impacted. For the location of land uses along the proposed project and alternative routes see Table C.8-3 in Section C.8 (Land Use and Public Recreation).

C.10.1.1.3 *Public Services*

The proposed project has the potential to place a demand on public services during construction and operation. Construction of the pipeline and associated construction support systems could create a demand for, or disruption to, public services and utilities in the immediate vicinity of the pipeline route. During pipeline operation a significant public service demand could be placed on emergency service providers in the event of a major pipeline spill requiring emergency response. The following sections describe existing capabilities in fire and police protection, hazardous materials response, solid waste disposal, water supply, wastewater treatment, and other services and utilities.

Fire and Police Protection. Police protection is provided to the City of Long Beach by the Long Beach Police Department, and fire protection is provided to the City by the Long Beach Fire Department. City of Long Beach Fire Station #12, located at 6509 Gundry Avenue, would most likely respond to project-related emergencies because of its close proximity to the project area.

Police and fire service are provided to other cities and unincorporated County areas along the proposed project and alternative routes by the County of Los Angeles Sheriff's Department and the Los Angeles County Fire Department (which is a consolidated fire protection district), respectively. Los Angeles County Fire Stations that would respond to emergencies along the proposed and alternative routes include:

- **Station 10** - Located in the City of Carson at 1860 E. Del Amo Boulevard, just west of Wilmington Avenue
- **Station 105** - 18195 S. Santa Fe Avenue north of Del Amo Boulevard and south of Victoria Street, west of Compton Creek
- **Station 35** - Located in the City of Cerritos on Artesia Boulevard between Marquardt Avenue and Carmentita Road
- **Station 30** - Located in the City of Cerritos on the east side of Pioneer Boulevard, south of South Street
- **Station 115** - Located in the City of Norwalk on Alondra Boulevard at its approximate intersection with Gridley Road

Hazardous Materials Response. The Los Angeles County Health Department operates a Hazardous Materials Division with the authority to oversee clean-up operations and to enforce hazardous waste management. The response teams for the Hazardous Materials Division are headquartered in and dispatched from the City of Industry (Aspen, 1996). Each response team has five personnel trained in the handling of hazardous materials emergencies. These sub-divisions are currently understaffed and under-equipped to deal with present demands. The Department plans to develop satellite stations, but no start date for their operations has been determined.

The Los Angeles County Fire Department operates four acting "Health Hazmat Units" on 24-hour call with approximately 25 personnel. In addition to the Hazmat units, and in case of simultaneous accidents, the County Fire Department calls in its Inspection, Enforcement, and Mitigation Teams to respond to the

emergency. With the activation of these teams, there are 80 available personnel trained in emergency response (Aspen, 1996).

It should be noted that, in case of a pipeline spill, the Los Angeles County Fire Department follows a set of established emergency response procedures. The Department would first attempt to isolate the spill, if possible, and would then proceed to identify and evaluate the spilled material. The Los Angeles County Health Hazard Unit and other agencies with jurisdiction over the affected area are then notified.

Schools. The Los Angeles Unified School District and Compton Unified School District operate 19 schools within the City of Carson. California State University at Dominguez Hills is also located within the City of Carson. Unincorporated Rancho Dominguez, northeast of Carson, does not contain any public schools. The Long Beach Unified School District operates 90 schools in the City of Long Beach. California State University at Long Beach is also located in Long Beach. Eleven public schools within the City of Bellflower and nine public schools within the City of Paramount are operated by the Bellflower, Downey, and Paramount School Districts. The 19 public schools in the City of Cerritos are served by the ABC Unified School District. Cerritos College is also located within the City of Cerritos boundaries. The Norwalk-La Mirada Unified School District and the Little Lake Unified School District operate public schools in the City of Norwalk. A limited number of Norwalk students attend schools within the ABC Unified School District and the Whittier Union High School District, which are located outside of the City's boundaries. For the location of schools along the proposed project and alternative routes see Tables C.8-3 through C.8-9 in Section C.8 (Land Use and Public Recreation).

Solid Waste. Non-hazardous solid waste generated during construction of the pipeline would consist of two basic forms: solid waste materials left over from construction (e.g., pipe sections, valve assemblies, coating supplies, etc.) and excess soil produced during excavation for the pipeline. These wastes could be disposed at municipal landfills serving the communities along the pipeline route. Clean soil materials (including rock and boulders) may be recycled or relocated to sites that can use them. The disposal of hazardous waste is discussed in Section C.5 (Environmental Contamination). Disposal of solid wastes within the project area is provided by county, city, and private entities. A mixture of municipal public works departments and private refuse companies provide for collection of residential and commercial waste in the project area.

There are nine major landfills currently serving the County of Los Angeles. Based upon current landfill capacities and the volume of wastes generated, the County expects that capacity shortfalls could occur by the year 2008 (Aspen, 1996). The Puente Hills Landfill is located approximately 14 miles from the project area and is expected to be the primary landfill utilized for the project (PEA, 1997). This landfill currently receives approximately 12,000 tons of municipal solid waste and inert wastes daily (PEA, 1997). Alternative landfill sites for deposition of non-hazardous solid wastes include the Scholl Canyon or Olinda Alpha Landfills. Concrete and asphalt could be sent to Blue Diamond Inc., a demolition materials recrushing company with locations in Carson, South Gate, Orange, and Fullerton. In the City of Long Beach, waste service is provided by the City Department of Public Works, Refuse Collection Division.

Public Finances. Potential revenue sources from the proposed project to local governments include property taxes, sales taxes, and franchise fees. Property taxes on pipelines are assessed in two ways. The first is on the physical materials, including pipe, valves, pumps, etc., including installation costs. The second is on rights-of-way, easements, and other lands. Assessments and tax liability on the physical materials are established by the California State Board of Equalization, based on the Fair Market Value (Aspen, 1996).

Fair Market Value is established primarily by income, rate base, and replacement value. Assessments and tax liability for the rights-of-way and other lands are established by the county being traversed, based again on a Fair Market Value determination. The determination of Fair Market Value for rights-of-way and land is somewhat more difficult in that it is variable. The State Board of Equalization advises affected counties of their proportionate share of total tax liability based on per-mile valuations furnished by the pipeline company. Each county then adds the tax liability furnished by the State Board of Equalization to its established liability for lands and rights-of-way and bills the pipeline company directly. Taxes are then distributed to the various taxing districts in the manner established by each particular county.

A new pipeline such as the proposed project, would be taxed at about 1.1% of new construction cost plus 1.1% of easement value. The monies derived would go directly to Los Angeles County. The amount of property tax specifically accruing to each city traversed by the new pipeline is dependent upon the County distribution formula (Aspen, 1996).

The sales tax rate for Los Angeles County, and all of the cities traversed by the proposed project and alternative routes is 8.25% (PEA, 1997). Sales tax would be paid on purchases made by construction and operation employees and for any purchased equipment and materials for the proposed project, within the study area. The average property tax rate for Los Angeles County is 1.05%.

Table C.10-4 lists the estimated anticipated franchise fees that SFPP would pay to the jurisdictions along the pipeline route. The annual franchise fees accruing to cities and counties are governed by the State Public Utilities Code (Section 6231.5).

Table C.10-4 Estimated Franchise Fees Resulting from Project Operation (Proposed Route)

Jurisdiction	Mileage*	Feet	Fee at .50 Cents/Ft.
Los Angeles County	3	15,840	\$7,920
City of Carson	0.5	2,640	\$1,320
City of Long Beach	3.75	19,800	\$9,900
City of Bellflower	3.5	18,480	\$9,240
City of Cerritos	1.25	6,600	\$3,300
City of Artesia	1	5,280	\$2,640
City of Norwalk	1	5,280	\$2,640
Total	14	73,920	\$36,960

*Approximate mileage.

Note: Mileage in each jurisdiction would differ if the alternative segments were utilized rather than the proposed route.

C.10.1.1.4 Utilities

Public utilities run parallel to, or cross, most of the ROW of the proposed pipeline route. These utilities include: water mains, sewer pipes, and storm drains; and power lines, gas mains, and telephone lines; and other petroleum product pipelines. (Figure C.11-1 in Section C.11, System Safety, shows existing hazardous liquids pipelines in the area.) Utility companies post signs along the corridors that they use. Also, a general depository of information on the location of underground utilities is provided to contractors and others by Underground Service Alert (also known as Dig Alert), a non-profit organization supported by utility firms. For a discussion of existing pipelines and the potential for co-locational accidents see Section C.11 (System Safety and Risk of Upset).

The exact utility locations along the project corridor would be determined during preparation of the final pipeline designs and the development of detailed construction plans (PEA, 1997). After construction, the pipeline location will be identified through two primary means. First, utility companies generally post signs along the corridors in which their lines are located. Signs for oil and gas pipelines are typically yellow or red plates on metal stakes identifying the owner, name of the pipeline, and a telephone number for reporting problems. Second, Underground Service Alert maintains a computer database system of companies with buried utilities, so people planning subsurface excavation can find exact locations of buried pipelines.

California state law requires that an excavator must contact a regional notification center at least two days prior to excavation of any subsurface installations. The center for southern California is Underground Service Alert. Anyone about to begin an excavation project can call Underground Service Alert's toll-free hotline, and they will notify the utilities that may have buried lines within 1,000 feet of the excavation. Representatives of the utilities are required to mark the specific location of their facilities within the work area prior to the start of excavation. The excavator is required to probe and expose the underground

Table C.10-5 Utilities in Artesia Boulevard (Proposed Pipeline in City of Bellflower)

Street/Location	Portion of Street	Utilities Present
Artesia Blvd. at Clark Ave. (no utilities in center 40% of street)	North 35%	6" Powerine Oil 8" Tidewater Oil 16" Bellflower City Water 8" South SW * 4" Southern California Gas 4" Southern California Gas (abandoned)
	South 25%	6" Bellflower water 8" SW Bellflower * 10" Union Oil 2" Southern California Gas
Artesia Blvd. at Palo Verde (no utilities in center 60% of street)	North 25%	8" Somerset Municipal water 2" Southern California Gas (abandoned) 4" Southern California Gas 10" Somerset Municipal water 10" Army Gasoline 12" Bellflower *
	South 15%	2" Southern California Gas 4" Shell Gasoline 3" Shell Gasoline 6" Somerset Municipal Water
Artesia Blvd. at Woodruff (no utilities in center 40% of street)	North 35%	Pacific Telephone duct General Telephone duct 3" Southern California Gas 8" SS Water 4" Southern California Gas
	South 25%	3 Standard Oil Pipelines 10" Municipal water 4" Somerset Municipal water 6" Southern California Gas
Artesia Blvd. at Lakewood (no utilities in center 30% of street)	North 35%	4" Southern California Gas 4" Southern California Gas (abandoned) 16" Bellflower water 8" SW Bellflower * 8" Tidewater Oil 6" Powerine Oil
	South 35%	6" Union Oil (abandoned) 10" Union Oil 6" Bellflower water 8" Bellflower water 2" Southern California Gas

* Pipeline type not specified; presumed to be water lines.
 Source: Brohard, 1997.

facilities by hand prior to using power equipment. Table C.10-5 provides the location of utilities within Artesia Boulevard (City of Bellflower) that potentially could be affected by the proposed project. Table C.10.6 shows utilities in selected locations on Lakewood and Alondra Boulevards (Alondra Alternative and Bellflower Rail Alternative).

Water. The proposed project would require potable or reclaimed water to be purchased from local water districts for dust suppression and hydrostatic testing. Water service is provided to cities along the proposed project and alternative routes by a variety of water purveyors. Water service in Carson is provided by the

Table C.10-6 Utilities in Alondra and Lakewood Boulevard (Alternative Pipeline Segments)

Street/Location	Portion of Street	Utilities Present
Alondra Blvd.* at Clark	all (evenly spaced)	General Telephone duct 12" Bellflower water 3" Southern California Gas (abandoned) 4" Southern California Gas 8" Bellflower water 10" Somerset Municipal water 12" Bellflower water 39" RCP Alondra Blvd Storm Drain
Alondra Blvd.* at Lakewood (no utilities in center 40% of street)	North 35%	12" Paramount Oil 2" Southern California Gas (abandoned) 6" Southern California Gas Pacific Telephone duct
	South 35%	Southern California Edison duct and vaults
Lakewood Blvd. at Alondra (no utilities in center 85% of street)	East 15% only	12" Bellflower water 4" Southern California Gas 2" County Water 4" Richfield Gasoline 8" Richfield Oil
Lakewood Blvd. at Artesia (no utilities in center 50% of street)	West 15%	6" Union Gas 8" SSW **
	East 35%	10" SS Water 6" Bellflower (water) 8" Richfield Oil 4" Richfield Gas 4" Southern California Gas

Source: Brohard, 1997.

* **Note regarding Alondra Blvd:** The center portion of this street (including the median and one lane on either side) through the City of Bellflower is underlain by an old Portland cement roadbed. Construction of the pipeline through this material would be difficult, at best, and very expensive, so the outer lanes would probably have to be used (Brohard, 1997).

** Pipeline type not specified; presumed to be water lines.

Dominguez Water Corporation and Southern California Water Company. The City of Long Beach is served by the Long Beach Water Department. The City of Paramount, Department of Public Works, Water Division provides the City with the majority of its water supply; remaining portions are served by Peerless and Southern California Water Companies (Moreno, 1997). Bellflower is served by six purveyors, including the Bellflower-Somerset Mutual, Peerless, County, Bellflower Home Garden, Bigby Townsite, and Park Water Companies. Water service in the City of Cerritos is provided by the City of Cerritos Water Department, and Metropolitan Water District.

A groundwater well and a 12 million gallon underground water reservoir are major components of the City of Cerritos water system, providing one-third of the City's total groundwater supply (Cerritos, 1997). In addition, Cerritos also uses this well and reservoir to supply water to the residents of the Cities of Norwalk and Artesia through service connections with other water purveyors. Water service providers in the City of Norwalk include Park Water Company, Southern California Water Company, Norwalk Municipal Water System, Santa

Fe Springs Water Company, County Water Company, and the City of Cerritos. There is a major 24 inch water transmission main located on 166th Street in Norwalk (Cerritos, 1997).

Many water districts in Los Angeles County have developed or are planning reclaimed water programs. Two conditions are necessary: treatment of the water to secondary or tertiary (sub-potable) standards; and installation of delivery pipelines. Reclaimed water must be kept separate from drinking water and is used for industrial, ground water recharge and landscaping needs. Reclaimed water is priced lower than drinking water. It would be usable by the project for dust suppression and hydrostatic testing where available. There are reclaimed water programs either on-line or in development by virtually all the water districts in Los Angeles County. Each water district sets standards on use, primarily to avoid liability problems (Aspen, 1996). In general, districts permit use only between 10 PM and 6 AM to avoid human contact with mist. Signs must be posted that the area is treated with reclaimed water. Approval from the water districts would be required for use of reclaimed water on this project.

Wastewater. Sewer service in each of the jurisdictions along the proposed project and alternative routes is provided by city-operated lines which feed into Los Angeles County Sanitation District trunk sewers. Similarly, storm water flows are conveyed by flood control facilities of each respective city, and the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works.

Other Utilities. Electric, natural gas, and telephone service for the cities and unincorporated County areas along the proposed project and alternative routes are provided as follows:

- Southern California Edison Company provides electricity
- Natural gas service is provided to the City of Long Beach by the City Gas Department. Southern California Gas Company provides gas service to Carson, Long Beach, Paramount, Bellflower, Cerritos, Norwalk, and Dominguez Hills
- Pacific Telephone Company (Pacific Bell) serves the City of Carson, unincorporated Rancho Dominguez, and a portion of the City of Long Beach. General Telephone Company (GTE) also serves a portion of the City of Long Beach, as well as the cities of Bellflower, Paramount, Cerritos, and Norwalk.

C.10.1.1.5 Properties Surrounding DFSP Norwalk Station

Brief Summary of Contamination. As described in more detail in Section C.5.1, the Defense Fuel Support Point Norwalk (DFSP Norwalk) has been operating since 1923, and the military has been operating the facility since 1951. In addition, SFPP has an easement over a portion of the facility to allow its shipment of products from the military tanks and as a location for pipeline pumps. Diesel, gasoline, and jet fuel (JP-4 and JP-5) spills and leaks from tanks and pipeline valves were recorded from 1968 to 1975, and a leaky valve was discovered on the existing SFPP pipeline was discovered in 1994 at the east side of the facility.

Site investigation to define soil and groundwater contamination began in 1982, and continued to 1992, resulting in disclosure that soil and groundwater contamination exists on the DFSP Norwalk site. As of July 1997 groundwater contaminant plumes extend off site approximately 400 feet to the south and 600 feet to the

northwest (see Figure C.5-1, Section C.5). Contamination consists of petroleum hydrocarbons and fuel constituents such as benzene and 1,2-dichloroethane (1,2-DCA), and the fuel additive methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE). Remediation of contaminated soil and groundwater is underway. Remedial efforts have recovered about 200,000 gallons of fuel and treated 12 million gallons of contaminated groundwater through June 15, 1997.

Properties Surrounding DFSP Norwalk Station. The tank farm is bounded by residential properties on the south, west, and north, and a park and elementary school on the east. The properties on the south and the park to the east, are immediately adjacent to the tank farm; the houses to the west and north are across the streets (Norwalk Boulevard and Excelsior Drive, respectively). Maps of the contaminant plumes (see Figure C.5-1) show that contamination has migrated south and west of the tank farm, but the plumes do not currently extend east or north. Therefore this study will focus on the properties to the south and west.

South of Norwalk Station. Properties on the north side of Cheshire Street abut the Norwalk Station at the rear walls of their properties. They include:

- Nine properties zoned as high-density residential. Three of these properties are currently occupied by single-family homes, one is vacant, and the other five are occupied by small apartment buildings.
- 15 single-family homes, directly south of and adjacent to the Norwalk Station
- 19 single-family homes on the east end of Cheshire, south of and adjacent to the pipeline easement that separates Holifield Park from the houses.

On the south side of Cheshire Street, between Norwalk Boulevard and Bloomfield, there are 17 single-family homes (13 with addresses on the north/south streets) and seven lots zoned for high-density residential uses.

West of Norwalk Station. This neighborhood consists entirely of single-family homes, including the following:

- 14 homes facing Norwalk Boulevard, directly across the street from the Norwalk Station
- 13 homes on Ibez Avenue, just west of Norwalk Boulevard and south of Excelsior
- Homes on Excelsior (north and south sides) between Norwalk Boulevard and Grayland
- Homes on Hopland, Molette, and Barnwall Streets where each street has two homes at the corner of Norwalk Boulevard
- Homes on Highdale and Ferina Streets, just west of Ibez and south of Excelsior.

C.10.1.2 Applicable Laws, Regulations, and Standards

A variety of laws, regulations, and standards apply to socioeconomics, public services and utilities for each jurisdiction traversed by the proposed project and alternatives and are described below.

State of California. With respect to the costs to businesses, property owners, and public service providers related to a pipeline spill event, the Oil Pipeline Environmental Responsibility Act has very specific financial

responsibility requirements that address such consequences. This Act is discussed in detail in Section C.11.1.2 (System Safety and Risk of Upset).

State law requires an excavator to contact a regional notification center such as Underground Service Alert (described above) at least two days prior to breaking ground to determine location of utilities. Excavators are required to probe and expose the underground facilities by hand prior to using power equipment.

Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG). The Growth Management Chapter of SCAG's Regional Comprehensive Plan and Guide contains core policies including (SCAG, 1996):

- Encourage the efforts of local jurisdiction, employers and service agencies to provide adequate training and retraining of workers, and prepare the labor force to meet future challenges of the regional economy
- Encourage employment development in job-poor localities through support of labor force retraining programs and other economic development measures
- Support local jurisdictions' efforts to minimize cost of infrastructure and public service delivery, and efforts to seek new sources of funding for development and provision of services
- Support local jurisdictions' actions to minimize red tape and expedite the permitting process to maintain economic vitality and competitiveness
- Encourage mitigation measures to develop emergency response.

Los Angeles County

Policies of the County of Los Angeles General Plan for emergency response, preparedness, and recovery include:

- **27.** Strengthen the capability of County agencies to effectively respond to earthquake and non-earthquake induced emergencies
- **28.** Upgrade regional heavy rescue capability including mobilization operations and resource management
- **29.** Encourage critical facilities to maintain and regularly update emergency response plans identifying safety procedures, disaster control capabilities, and evacuation procedures such as drills and exercises
- **30.** Upgrade interagency and multi-jurisdictional communications, planning and decision making to ensure efficient and integrated emergency response capability
- **31.** Promote improved cooperation with nonprofit and private sector emergency response organizations
- **34.** Encourage the improvement of hazard prediction and early warning capability.

City of Carson

Carson's Emergency Operations Plan provides for mobilization of public and private resources to meet the needs of any emergency or disaster (Carson, 1981). Carson's Office of Emergency Services will coordinate with City services in the event of an emergency to ensure:

- Fire suppression, rescue and paramedic service
- Traffic control and evacuation of endangered areas
- Emergency relocation sites
- Public works facilities and public utilities
- Public information and emergency directives
- Radiological monitoring.

Carson participates in the California master mutual aid agreement among local governments and will promote inter-departmental and inter-community coordination and cooperation. The City's First Priority Program for emergency response includes: establishment of an adequate City communications system; and adoption of an emergency preparedness capability via an emergency operation center, field command unit and related field support activities.

City of Long Beach

According to the City of Long Beach General Plan, Public Safety Element, fire prevention laws and regulations at the State and local levels are considered adequate (Long Beach, 1975). Hazardous fire conditions are well controlled via the permit issuance program required by the Fire Prevention Bureau. Special permits are required for most hazardous materials and processes.

City of Bellflower

The City of Bellflower requires that all emergency plans be coordinated with the City's recently adopted Standardized Emergency Management System (SEMS) Multihazard Function Plan.

The City of Bellflower Construction and Demolition Recycling Program encourages all contractors working in Bellflower to recycle their construction and demolition debris. Construction and demolition recycling helps the City achieve its goal of reaching the State's refuse diversion target of 50% by the year 2000.

City of Cerritos

Policy 13.05 of the City of Cerritos states that the City is a member of the Civil Defense Area E which includes other local jurisdictions (Cerritos, 1988). Plans have been formulated for Area E to cope with essential needs in serious emergencies. The Plan includes warning systems and communications, rescue and medical care, evacuation and shelter.

City of Norwalk General Plan

In addition to the emergency response services provided by the Los Angeles County Fire District, the City of Norwalk's General Plan evaluates its ability to respond to hazards, in concert with the State of California Office of Emergency Services, and other agencies. City Policy 4a, addressing safety from hazards, requires the following (Norwalk, 1996):

- Continually review and strengthen codes and ordinances dealing with hazardous housing, building conditions and fire safety
- Consult the County of Los Angeles Sheriff's Department and Fire Department or any other emergency response agency during review of development projects
- Continue to provide safety related services through the City of Norwalk Department of Public Safety.

C.10.2 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES: PROPOSED PROJECT

Two components of the proposed project could create socioeconomic impacts: project construction and project operation. The public services impact analysis focuses on a demand for services beyond capacity. Assessment of effects on utilities includes a discussion of disruption of public utilities and an increase in service demand. The criteria used for determination of impact significance are described below. Section C.5, Environmental Contamination, addresses issues related to contaminated soil and disposal of hazardous materials. Section C.11, System Safety and Risk of Upset, comprehensively addresses safety impacts and measures used to reduce risk of upset and to respond to emergency incidents.

C.10.2.1 Significance Criteria

The criteria used for assessment of impacts are described below.

Socioeconomics

Housing. The impact on permanent housing would be significant if demand for housing generated by project-induced immigration resulted in: (1) increases in housing rent or prices by more than 10% or (2) decreased vacancy rates to less than 5%, or (3) decreased vacancy rates by more than 20% if already below 5%. Lesser housing impacts would be considered either adverse or beneficial depending on the circumstances.

Employment. The impact of the project on construction period employment patterns could be either beneficial or adverse. If unemployment in the region were reduced without causing a large influx of new employees into the region, it would be considered a beneficial impact (Class IV). If, however, labor shortages result in a competition for labor that drives up wage rates or an influx of workers who compete for existing housing, the employment impacts could be significant (Class I or Class II).

Businesses Along Project Route. Project construction could impact businesses along the route by displacing them, by disrupting access, by increasing operating costs (e.g., dust control), or by disrupting business activities. Any impact that causes the permanent displacement or relocation of a business would be a significant impact (Class I). The significance of temporary business disruption would depend on the nature

and extent of disruption. Any impact which causes the permanent disruption (seven days or more) of a business is significant (Class I); for a duration of 3-7 days is a significant but mitigable (Class II) impact. Any impact which causes a temporary business disruption of one to three days is an adverse but not significant (Class III) impact. Businesses that benefit by selling supplies to the contractors or labor force could be beneficially impacted (Class IV).

Public Services

Fire and Police Protection. Impacts are considered significant (Class I or II) if project-induced population growth creates the need for any additional personnel to maintain the current level of service, or if the accidental release or spill of product from the proposed pipeline places demand on emergency service providers exceeding current capacity.

Schools. Project-related growth that adds six or more students to a single district is considered significant (Class I or II) for school districts with available capacity, while the addition of one or more students is considered adverse, but not significant (Class III). If school capacity will be exceeded with baseline growth, project-related demand of one or more students is significant.

Solid Waste. 5% or more of the expected average annual increase in waste generation for a given facility as a result of project construction or project-related population growth is significant (Class I or II); 1% or more of the average annual increase is adverse but not significant (Class III).

Public Finance. Project-related fiscal impacts are significant if the annual net fiscal deficit is estimated to be \$1,000 or more. Beneficial impacts are considered "substantial" if the projected budget surplus is equal to or greater than 1% of the projected budget revenues for a given year.

Utilities. Impacts to public utilities would be significant (Class I or II) if:

- The construction and operation of the pipeline could permanently displace, alter, or disrupt the existing public and private utility lines and services
- The accidental release of product and subsequent cleanup and maintenance activities would disrupt existing utilities or exceed capacity of public services or utilities
- Emergency access is precluded to utility lines along the pipeline corridor during or after pipeline construction

Water. An increase in water demand, if projected demand exceeds supply, is significant (Class I or II).

Energy. The energy requirements of the project during construction or operation would be considered significant (Class I or II) if they (1) exceed capacity of electric and communications utility services or disrupt their plans for providing service; (2) place a substantial burden on existing resources; or (3) entail inefficient and unnecessary consumption of energy and uses of nonrenewable resources.

C.10.2.2 Applicant Proposed Measures

SFPP has committed to implementing the following impact reduction measures (SFPP 1997):

- 1 Plan with public agencies in Los Angeles County to provide consultation and training as appropriate to emergency service providers to ensure adequate emergency response to pipeline related accidents.
- 2 Make arrangements, prepare signage, obtain health approvals, and use reclaimed water, wherever available, for dust suppression during construction.
- 3 Make arrangements to move uncontaminated rock and soil to sites that need these materials for fill, rather than to landfills.
- 4 Notify Underground Service Alert at least two days prior to construction activities. Underground Service Alert will, in turn, notify affected members of the impending activity at or near the underground installation. The notified members are required to mark the specific location of their facilities within the work area prior to the start of construction. Thereafter, the construction crew shall probe to determine the exact locations of utilities. In some cases the law requires the excavator to expose the underground utilities by hand before full use of power equipment.
- 5 Require the construction contractor to prepare construction plans designed to protect utilities and shall provide the plans to affected jurisdictions for review, revision, and final approval.

C.10.2.3 Impacts and Mitigation Measures: Pipeline Construction

C.10.2.3.1 *Socioeconomics*

The proposed pipeline route would be 13 miles long, extending from SFPP's Watson Station in Carson to the Norwalk Station in the City of Norwalk. SFPP has estimated that construction would proceed at 300 to 500 feet per day; however, recent urban pipeline construction has proceeded at less than 200 feet per day. In total, construction is expected to require six months for completion. About 95 personnel would be employed on the project during peak construction period (second quarter of construction). Table B.4-1 in Part B (Project Description) provides data on construction personnel requirements. Approximately 60 percent of the workforce would be skilled, and 40 percent unskilled. The majority of the work force would likely originate from the southern California area, mainly from the Los Angeles Basin. It is expected that most laborers would commute to designated staging areas and proceed to construction sites via trucks provided by SFPP. Given SFPP's use of local workers, the fact that laborers would commute to the project area, and the temporary nature of construction activities, there would be no incentive for project workers to relocate. Thus, no construction-related population immigration is expected as a result of the proposed project. Pipeline construction impacts on population, housing, and employment within the study area would be negligible.

Construction could have a short-term beneficial impact (**Class IV**) by generating employment in businesses that supply materials and services to the construction activity. This beneficial impact could affect equipment and construction materials suppliers, fuel and water suppliers, haulers and disposal companies, staff from utility companies that coordinate with the pipeline construction to avoid conflicts with their systems, and retailers and food suppliers.

C.10.2.3.2 Businesses in the Immediate Vicinity of the Pipeline

Air Quality and Noise Impacts on Businesses. Businesses in the immediate vicinity of the pipeline route would experience some disruption from air quality impacts due to dust generation and increased emissions from heavy equipment during construction. In addition, construction equipment activities could result in noise disruptions and nuisance to businesses. Impacts are described in more detail in Sections A.2 (Air Quality) and A.9 (Noise), both of which include mitigation measures to reduce identified impacts. These impacts would be further mitigated by implementing Mitigation Measure S-1 below.

Traffic Impacts on Business. Construction-related traffic impacts on businesses along the project route would include impedance of access. Lane closures and heavy equipment traffic could prevent consumers from gaining easy access to a particular business. Section C.12, Transportation and Traffic, includes a detailed discussion of construction-related traffic impacts, and mitigation measures regarding access concerns. Mitigation Measure S-1 would further reduce traffic impacts on businesses. However, if construction traffic in the vicinity of any business causes a disruption of more than three days, but less than seven days, impacts would be significant but mitigable (Class II) by using Mitigation Measure S-2, compensation of businesses.

Displacement or Disruption of Business. Construction (and/or operation) of the proposed project is not expected to cause the displacement or permanent disruption of any business along the pipeline route. Should such impacts be identified in the Business Impact Mitigation Plan (Mitigation Measure S-1), they shall be mitigated by using Mitigation Measure S-2, compensation of businesses.

Mitigation Measures for Disruption of Businesses. Mitigation Measures S-1 and S-2 are recommended to mitigate air quality, noise, traffic, and disruption or displacement impacts to businesses.

Impact: Dust generation, increased emissions from heavy equipment, and noise during construction has the potential to disrupt businesses along project route (**Class II**).

Impact: Lane closures and heavy equipment traffic could impede access to businesses along the project route. Access impedance of 3-7 days is a **Class II** Impact; 1-3 days is **Class III**.

S-1 SFPP shall identify a business relations coordinator 60 days before the start of project construction. The responsibility of the business relations coordinator shall include the preparation of a Business Impact Mitigation Plan. At least 30 days prior to the start of construction, the coordinator shall contact all businesses along the pipeline route to inform them of the specific nature of the potential disruptions and to identify related issues and concerns, and to obtain their input regarding impact mitigation. Construction scheduling shall be designed to minimize business impacts. The Business Impact Mitigation Plan shall also integrate applicable mitigation measures from this EIR for this and other issues such as air quality, noise, traffic, and soil contamination. This plan shall be prepared by SFPP and be reviewed and approved by the CPUC and appropriate city and Los Angeles County planning agencies at least 30 days before construction. Following the preparation of the Business Impact Mitigation Plan and within two weeks of commencement of construction in a specific area, the

coordinators shall contact the businesses again to implement specific mitigation measures and to resolve any remaining concerns and issues. The CPUC and appropriate city and county agencies shall participate in and monitor the implementation of the plan.

- S-2** SFPP shall meet with individual business owners immediately adjacent to the pipeline ROW at least 30 days prior to the start of construction to determine how construction can be completed with minimal disruption to businesses, based on the access needs, locations, and business hours of each business. Compensation (if any) for the use and blockage of access ways to businesses shall be determined based on documentation provided by business owners regarding loss of revenue or other effects. SFPP shall compensate any business disrupted, displaced, or forced to relocate due to the construction or operation of the proposed project. If a business owner believes business has been diminished without compensation, SFPP shall participate in binding arbitration by neutral arbitrators (agreeable to SFPP and the business owner) to determine the amount of compensation, if any due to the business owner. All businesses shall be informed of this provision thirty (30) days prior to the start of construction.

C.10.2.3.3 Public Services

Fire and Police Protection. A high demand for fire and police protection services during construction is not anticipated. Fire protection services could potentially be required during construction in the event of an accident. Impacts associated with the risk of a construction accident would be distributed among the stations of the Los Angeles County Fire Department and the City of Long Beach Fire Department.

During construction, the project would require the temporary closure of traffic lanes and subsequent impedance of traffic on several major thoroughfares. This would have a potentially significant but mitigable (**Class II**) impact on patrol and response capabilities. This impact is addressed in Section C.12, Transportation and Traffic, with Mitigation Measure T-1. Also, Section C.11, System Safety and Risk of Upset, discusses accident scenarios during construction and presents mitigation measures requiring development of an Urban Spill Response Plan (Mitigation Measure SS-16). In addition, SFPP would provide advanced notice of construction locations, road closure schedules, and potential alternate routes to emergency service providers near the proposed route (see Section C.12.2). With applicant proposed measure 1 discussed in Section C.10.2.2, SFPP proposes to provide consultation and training to emergency service providers to ensure adequate response to pipeline related accidents.

Schools. Based on the small size of the construction crews and the utilization of local labor for construction work there would be no additional pressure placed on schools due to population immigration as a result of this project.

Solid Waste. Trench excavation activities will generate approximately 45,760 cubic yards (cy) of material along the 13-mile route. SFPP estimates that 22,800 cy of excavated soils will be used to backfill trench. The remaining volumes for disposal will include approximately 7,626 cy of concrete/asphalt rubble and 15,253 cy of soil. While excess uncontaminated soil could legally be disposed in a landfill, this would be a wasteful use of limited available space. SFPP's Applicant Proposed Measure 3 discussed in Section C.10.2.2 proposes

movement of uncontaminated soil to sites that need materials for fill, rather than to landfills. Therefore, impacts to solid waste facilities would be adverse, but not significant (**Class III**). In addition, as described in Section C.10.1.2, the City of Bellflower encourages the recycling of construction and debris, and has a list of approved recyclers that can be obtained through the City's Public Services Department. The disposal of contaminated soil is discussed in Section C.5, Environmental Contamination.

Public Finances. Sales tax revenues as a result of construction materials purchased from local suppliers, including retail and food purchases made by construction workers could have a potential short-term beneficial impact (**Class IV**) on public finances.

C.10.2.3.4 Utilities

Service Disruption. After probing within streets or shoulders, a route for the pipe within the easement can usually be defined that bypasses existing utilities. Historic data indicate that construction of a buried utility in a crowded corridor will lead to approximately two instances of damage to another utility line (INTECH, 1992). Given the large number of utilities that are present in the pipeline corridor, some service disruptions during construction would be expected. These disruptions could occur while the pipeline is laid in the trench and the interrupted utility reconnected around the new pipeline placement. Service interruption would likely occur for only a few hours and those whose services would be interrupted would be notified in advance by USA (Underground Service Alert) of the unavoidable interruption. This impact is considered adverse, but not significant (**Class III**).

Construction Accident. The proposed pipeline would parallel or cross numerous utility lines, such as crude oil and product pipelines, and water, sewer, electricity, natural gas, and telecommunication lines. Trenching could accidentally damage one or more of these lines. Under State law, SFPP is required to contact USA prior to ground-breaking activities to determine the location of utilities in the pipeline ROW and notify utility owners of excavation plans. In addition, Applicant Proposed Measure 5 discussed in Section C.10.2.2 requires construction contractors to prepare construction plans designed to protect utilities and to provide those plans to affected jurisdictions for review, revision, and final approval. With USA notification, and implementation of Applicant Proposed Measure 5, construction-related impacts to utilities would be reduced to an adverse impact (**Class III**).

Water. Water from water districts or treatment plants would be used as necessary to control fugitive dust and to wash streets as a supplement to sweeping streets. A total use of 10,000 gallons of water per day is estimated for these purposes. In addition to the daily construction water needs, hydrostatic testing of the pipeline would also require water. The volume of water estimated to be required to test the proposed 16-inch pipeline would be approximately 675,000 gallons. Hydrotest water will be obtained from local water districts. Special provisions would be required for reclaimed water where available from local water districts. Either reclaimed or potable water would be available to control construction emissions. Reclaimed water would also be available for hydrostatic testing of the pipeline's integrity following construction. If water use is reduced through use of reclaimed water (Applicant Proposed Measure 2 in Section C.10.2.2) for dust suppression and hydrotesting, the impact on water providers would not be significant (**Class III**). Mitigation Measure S-3 from

the Draft EIR has been deleted due to the infeasibility of obtaining and using reclaimed water in the project area.

Wastewater. The majority of wastewater generated by construction would result from hydrotesting. The pipeline will be filled with water from the fire system at Watson Station. Upon completion of hydrotesting, water will be displaced from the pipe using oil-free compressors and collected in a portable tank at Watson to be tested and treated, if necessary, before disposal. Impacts to the sewer system of the study area is expected to be negligible.

Other Utilities. Project construction would require little demand for electrical power. Where needed, generators would be used onsite for power. As part of the Applicant's contract with its construction contractor, the contractor will be required to use only equipment with all required permits and licenses. Telephone service for construction activities may include service to a field office, as well as use of mobile phones. Construction activities would not require natural gas. Impacts to these utilities are expected to be negligible.

C.10.2.4 Impacts and Mitigation Measures: Station Modification

SFPP plans to modify certain existing facilities as a part of the proposed expansion project. Modifications to the existing Watson, Norwalk, Industry, and Colton stations would require a two- to six-month construction period. Station construction crews of approximately 111 workers (including specialized workers) will be responsible for the construction activities at the existing terminal and pump stations. Worker selection will be done by the construction contractor, but SFPP anticipates that the workers will come from the local area. Similar to project construction, station modifications are not expected to have any significant socioeconomic impacts related to population immigration, employment, or housing. In contrast to pipeline construction, there are no businesses that could be impacted by construction-related activities, therefore there would be no impacts on businesses. Given that all terminal-related modifications will occur within the boundaries and easements of the existing facilities, impacts on public services and utilities would be negligible.

C.10.2.5 Impacts and Mitigation Measures: Project Operation

C.10.2.5.1 Socioeconomics

The proposed project, as part of SFPP's pipeline system, would be remotely operated from SFPP's central control facility at the Orange Headquarters with back-up monitoring at the Watson and Colton stations. A staff of 16 people are currently employed at the central facility and are responsible for system control and operation 24 hours per day. A maintenance staff of 15 people currently works in the field carrying out routine inspection and maintenance as well as responding to possible system upset and/or failure emergencies. No additional positions to SFPP's existing staff will be required as a result of this project. Therefore, there would be no project-induced population impacts associated with project operation.

C.10.2.5.2 Businesses in the Immediate Vicinity of the Pipeline

A spill, including spill cleanup activities, could have significant impacts on the socioeconomic conditions related to businesses along the pipeline route. Socioeconomic impacts would depend on the specifics of the spill, including its size, location, timing, weather conditions, etc., and are difficult to quantify. There are a number of mitigation measures proposed in Section C.11 (System Safety and Risk of Upset) that would mitigate the socioeconomic impacts of a spill to **Class II** by reducing the likelihood of a spill occurring and the potential size of a spill. These measures include requiring SFPP to prepare and Urban Spill Response Plan (Mitigation Measure SS-16) (see Section C.11 for details). Note that Mitigation Measure S-4 from the Draft EIR has been deleted because it is now incorporated into Mitigation Measure SS-16.

C.10.2.5.3 Public Services

Fire and Police Protection/Hazardous Materials Response. A high state of readiness is required to mitigate impacts should an accident occur during operation. SFPP has a contractual agreement with a regional spill response cooperative that would serve as the emergency response contractor with primary responsibility for containment, cleanup, and health and safety in case of spills. SFPP's Oil Spill Response Plan lists third-party contractors providing manpower and equipment such as vacuum trucks, boats, oil skimmers, absorbent and skirted booms, dump trucks, portable tanks, absorbent materials, dispersants, steam cleaners, hydroblasters, cranes, and forklifts. These include contractors located in the Los Angeles Harbor area. In addition, SFPP operations personnel are trained in the Incident Command System and oil spill containment and cleanup procedures. In addition, local emergency service providers would be notified to assist in traffic control, evacuations of homes or businesses, crowd control, ambulance and hospital services, and backup fire protection services.

According to the California State Fire Marshal it is difficult to determine the adequacy of department resources for response to large spills and spill fires. The number of emergency response personnel required for any spill or fire would depend on many variables: the spill size, location, timing, weather conditions, etc. Los Angeles County Hazmat units, which can respond to a hazardous material accidents, are cross-staffed with County fire personnel. It should be noted that a Hazmat call reduces readiness to respond to a simultaneous request for fire suppression services. A large spill or spill fire could impact emergency service provision by placing demand that exceeds departmental capabilities. This is a potentially significant impact. Section C.11.2 (System Safety and Risk of Upset) includes Mitigation Measure SS-16 which requires modification of SFPP's Oil Spill Contingency Plan. This measure would reduce impacts on emergency service providers in the study area to **Class II**.

Schools/Solid Waste. Project operation is not expected to have significant impacts on schools or solid waste.

Public Finances. Property taxes on the pipeline and ongoing franchise revenues during project operation could have a long-term beneficial impact (**Class IV**) on the affected jurisdictions along the pipeline ROW (see Table C.10-4).

C.10.2.5.4 *Utilities*

The Carson Station will be modified by adding two new electric pumps (2,000 hp) and new metering equipment within the existing station boundaries. New electric pumps (two 1,750 hp) will be added at Industry Station (which currently has one pump, connected only to the 24/20-inch pipeline) to boost the pressure in the existing 16-inch pipeline. Although modifications to the Carson and Industry Stations would require an increase in the need for electric service to operate the new pumps, this demand for electric energy is not expected to exceed the existing electric capacity available to each station by a significant amount. Therefore, impacts on electric service capacity resulting from project operation would be adverse (**Class III**), but not significant.

C.10.2.5.5 *Impacts on Property Values*

During the scoping process for this EIR, concerns were expressed about the impacts of the proposed pipeline on property values. This concern is considered to be focused on residential property values, because the commercial and industrial properties in the project area are located on major streets which already contain one or more pipelines, and the use of major streets for pipelines is considered to be compatible with commercial and industrial land uses.

Quantifying the effects of pipelines on adjacent real estate values is extremely difficult. In order to provide utilities and other infrastructure necessary to sustain urban land uses, several types of pipelines are installed beneath nearly every city street. Urban utilities include gas pipelines, water and sewer pipelines, underground or aboveground electric transmission lines, and fiber optic and telecommunication cables.

Pipeline construction alone would not affect residential property values because construction occurs over a short time period (up to two weeks at any single location). Similarly, normal operation of a pipeline should not affect residential property values, since residents are not normally aware of utilities buried in city streets, and the presence of a pipelines in urban streets is not unusual. Even small pipeline spills or leaks would not generally have an impact on property values, because most urban spills can be contained and completely cleaned up within a few days.

However, property values could be affected by a pipeline in the street adjacent to a house or apartment if a major pipeline accident (leak or spill) occurred and contaminated either soil or groundwater to the extent that a long-term clean up was required. In such a case, residential property values could be affected by the following types of issues:

Disclosure: California law requires that sellers of residential properties disclose to potential buyers all matters that could affect the value of their property. To the extent that buyers decided not to purchase property with associated contamination, the pool of potential buyers would be reduced in size. California's mandatory Real Estate Transfer Disclosure Statement requires each seller of residential property to indicate whether the property has:

Substances, materials, or products which may be an environmental hazard such as, but not limited to, asbestos, formaldehyde, radon gas, lead-based paint, fuel or chemical storage tanks, and contaminated soil or water on the subject property.

The Transfer Disclosure form also requires the real estate agents involved in the sale of the property to disclose knowledge that could affect the value of the property, so even if the homeowner was not aware of the situation, the real estate agent would have to disclose the proximity of the contaminated area.

Financing: Bank appraisers must make note of contamination associated with a property in appraisal reports, or of a condition in the neighborhood that could affect the value of the property. To the extent lenders use these reports to make decisions on approving financing for a particular home, financing could be more difficult to obtain.

Use Restrictions: Local jurisdictions may restrict the use or development of properties with associated contamination, resulting in a potential loss in value. Within the City of Norwalk, there is a property zoned for High-Density Residential use, adjacent to the DFSP Norwalk Station (and over the contamination plume), on which the owner wanted to develop apartments or condominiums. Permission was delayed by the City's Planning Commission for a long period of time while the property was studied to evaluate the extent of the contamination. In December of 1997, the owner was given permission to construct (Anderson, 1997).

Publicity: Large contaminated sites usually receive publicity in local press, and as a result of neighborhood meetings or agency attempts at community involvement, resulting in perceptions of non-affected community members that the area in question should be avoided (whether the perception is in fact justified or not). This perception can affect demand for properties in the affected areas.

Because these issues are difficult to evaluate in abstract terms, this section will address each issue with respect to a specific contaminated site along the route of the proposed pipeline: the DFSP Norwalk Tank Farm. This area will be used to demonstrate actual impacts to residential properties resulting from proximity to a contaminated site.

DFSP Norwalk Station Contamination: Property Value Study

In the case of the DFSP Norwalk Station, the soil and groundwater contamination apparently was caused by a combination of pipeline leaks and storage tank leaks, so the extent of the contamination cannot be attributed solely to pipeline leakage. However, the situation serves as a reasonable model with which to attempt to evaluate property value impacts of contamination.

The difficulty in developing statistics to evaluate property values of a single factor (i.e., the contamination from the Norwalk Station) is that property values are affected by so many factors, it is difficult to isolate impacts from this single source. Property values in the vicinity of the Norwalk Station could be affected by the following variables, in addition to their proximity to contamination.

- Lot size, home size
- Condition of each individual home
- Market conditions
- Proximity to busy streets
- Availability of financing.

The plumes of contaminated groundwater and soils are apparently located below as many as 75 individual properties, as indicated in Figure C.5-1. For this analysis, recent sale prices of hundreds of homes in the vicinity of the contaminated area were compared to similar homes in nearby comparable neighborhoods. In order not to disclose the exact address of each home, the street name and the approximate location of each property are presented in this section. Using data from the Multiple Listing Service, houses sold in both areas during the past three years (when property values have been relatively stable) were identified.

Figure C.10-1 shows the location of the homes in or adjacent to the contaminated area, and also the locations of the similar homes outside of the contaminated area. Table C.10-7 presents the values of these properties (on a dollar per square foot basis).

The results of the property value comparison indicate that the range of property values in both areas is similar (in the general area, values range from \$92 to \$170 per square foot). This data is not sufficient to indicate whether the contamination from the Norwalk Station has had a negative impact on property values. However, as described above, other factors not evaluated in this study (e.g., time required for a property to sell, or properties that were listed for sale but did not sell at all) could provide additional data that would contribute to a more detailed analysis.

Values of Multi-Family Properties. Since the properties, considered as investment properties and not owner-occupied properties, tend to sell less frequently than single-family homes, it is even more difficult to assess impacts of proximity to a contaminated site. One measure of value, however, is the ability to derive income from the property and develop it in the manner in which it is zoned. At least one property owner on Cheshire proposed to develop his property, consistent with zoning. His plans were delayed significantly by the City's Planning Commission due to their concern about construction above the

Figure C.10-1

Table C.10-7 Property Value Comparison

Houses in or Near Contaminated Area				Houses NOT in or Near Contaminated Area			
Prop. ID	Street	Sale Date	\$/sq.ft.	Prop. ID	Street	Sale Date	\$/sq.ft.
A	Barnwall	3/97	\$133	1	Ibex	8/97	\$136
B	Barnwall	8/97	\$136	2	Grayland	7/97	\$130
C	Barnwall	7/97	\$117	3	Ferina	8/96	\$119
D	Hopland	5/96	\$144	4	Grayland	1/96	\$132
E	Ibex	5/97	\$155	5	Ibex	12/97	\$154
F	Norwalk	10/97	\$127	6	Norwalk	12/96	\$117
G	Norwalk	1/97	\$117	7	Hopland	10/96	\$132
H	Molette	5/97	\$140	8	Ibex	10/97	\$114
Average \$ per sq.ft.			\$133	Average \$ per sq.ft.			\$129

Source: Multiple Listing Service Data

contaminated plume. Soil testing was completed in 1997, concluding that construction of a multi-family residential building would not come into contact with the contaminated plume. The development proposal was approved in December of 1997.

C.10.2.6 Secondary Impacts of Project Operation

Proposed project operation would result in increased throughput in the CalNev Pipeline (Colton to Las Vegas) and SFPP's Phoenix-West Pipeline (Colton to Arizona) as well as increased transfer of product from SFPP to trucks at the Colton Terminal.

Socioeconomics. Secondary socioeconomic impacts of project operation are expected to be negligible. Increased throughput of product is not expected to result in population growth and the subsequent resulting employment and housing effects. No areas have been identified in which population immigration would be more likely as a result of the installation of the pipeline. In addition, the pipeline project would not serve in any way to reduce or eliminate barriers to growth in the region.

Public Services. With regard to public services, increased throughput could result in an increased need for emergency service provision such as fire and hazardous materials response. Areas adjacent to the pipelines' routes and truck transfer routes would be subjected to a slight increase in spill/contamination risk as a result of increased throughput in the pipelines. However, there are already existing risks associated with these pipelines and the increased risk is a relatively small increment.

Utilities. Project operation is not expected to have any significant effects on water capacity, sewer systems, or electric and communications service provision.

C.10.2.7 Cumulative Impacts

Co-Locational Accidents. Other pipelines (crude oil, gas, product, water) would be present along the pipeline ROW. There is a potential for co-locational accidents in such crowded utility corridors. In the event of a major accident, an adverse interaction between one of these pipelines and the proposed pipeline could occur, causing disruption of utility services. For example, rupture of the proposed pipeline could lead to a spill, gas release (from other pipelines in the ROW), and possibly a fire that would either impact other utilities or impede restoration of service. In addition, rupture of another pipeline in the common easement could damage or rupture the proposed pipeline. The potential consequences of a co-location accident that disrupts utility services could be significant even after mitigation (**Class I**). Section C.11 (System Safety and Risk of Upset) discusses the public safety impacts of a collocation accident. Mitigation Measure S-5 would help reduce the potential impact of a co-location accident.

I. Socioeconomics. Construction-related disturbances of the proposed project in combination with other construction activities along the pipeline route could result in increased air quality, noise, and traffic disruptions to adjacent businesses. These impacts would be significant, but can be reduced with the application of Land Use Mitigation Measure L-7 (see Section C.8, Land Use and Public Recreation) (**Class II**). L-7 requires SFPP to coordinate with affected agencies and proponents of proposed projects within or adjacent to the proposed pipeline route to minimize cumulative construction effects.

The overall potential cumulative socioeconomic impacts of a spill from petroleum products transport (via pipeline or trucks) in the study area, and the potential for co-located ruptures of other oil, gas, chemical, and/or product pipelines would be significant (**Class I**). The extent of damage to businesses and the housing and employment in the area would depend on the type of accident, spill, spill size, etc.

Public Services. In the event of multiple ruptures of the proposed pipeline or multiple accident in the vicinity of the proposed pipeline, there would be a significant (**Class I**) impact on public services. The need for emergency response would exceed the existing availability of resources, because of other response needs resulting from the other accident events. For more details on emergency response, see Section C.11 (System Safety and Risk of Upset).

Utilities. Utility access could be impeded during construction of the proposed project. This would include emergency access to utilities in the event of an accident that would disrupt a utility service. The impact is considered significant, but mitigable by Mitigation Measure T-5 (**Class II**) which requires the Applicant to develop a Transportation Management Plan (see Section C.12, Transportation and Traffic). Minimizing cumulative traffic impacts also would reduce impacts upon access to utilities. Mitigation Measure T-13 addresses this impact.

Impact: Potential consequences (**Class I**) of a co-location accident that disrupts utility services.

S-5 SFPP shall set priorities for disaster repair efforts on utility lines and transportation networks, subject to approval by the affected Offices of Emergency Services. Those utility lines vital to the region must be repaired ahead of other lines. A contact person shall be appointed to coordinate restoration. This information shall be included in the Oil Spill Contingency Plan (see Mitigation Measure SS-16 in Section C.11, System Safety and Risk of Upset).

C.10.2.8 Significant Unavoidable Impacts

The probability of a pipeline accident is addressed in Section C.11, and mitigation measures are proposed in that section to minimize the likelihood and size of a spill. Despite the small likelihood of a spill, the cumulative socioeconomic, public services, and utilities impacts of a spill from the proposed project and the potential for co-located ruptures of other oil, gas, chemical, and/or other product pipelines would be significant and unavoidable.

C.10.3 SANTA FE ALTERNATIVE SEGMENT

With the use of the Santa Fe Alternative Segment, construction and operation impacts on socioeconomics, public services, and utilities would be similar to those of the proposed project. Mitigation Measures S-1, S-2, S-3, S-4, S-5, SS-16, L-7, T-5, and T-13 would be applicable to this alternative.

C.10.4 CHERRY ALTERNATIVE SEGMENT

With the use of the Cherry Alternative Segment, construction and operation impacts on socioeconomics, public services, and utilities would be similar to those of the proposed project. Mitigation Measures S-1, S-2, S-3, S-4, S-5, SS-16, L-7, T-5, and T-13 would be applicable to this alternative.

C.10.5 PARAMOUNT ALTERNATIVE SEGMENT

With the use of the Paramount Alternative Segment, construction and operation impacts on socioeconomics, public services, and utilities would be similar to those of the proposed project. However, the City of Paramount would also be affected, and businesses along Alondra Boulevard would be affected rather than those along Artesia Boulevard (proposed route). Mitigation Measures S-1, S-2, S-3, S-4, S-5, SS-16, L-7, T-5, and T-13 would be applicable to this alternative.

C.10.6 ALONDRA ALTERNATIVE SEGMENT

With the use of the Alondra Alternative Segment, construction and operation impacts on socioeconomics, public services, and utilities would be similar to those of the proposed project. Mitigation Measures S-1, S-2, S-3, S-4, S-5, SS-16, L-7, T-5, and T-13 would be applicable to this alternative.

C.10.7 BELLFLOWER RAIL ALTERNATIVE SEGMENT

The Bellflower Rail Alternative Segment would eliminate 2.4 miles of construction on Artesia Boulevard and the pipeline would be located within a 100-foot wide railroad ROW. Given that Artesia Boulevard is a major thoroughfare and contains many businesses, this alternative would present significantly less impacts on socioeconomics, public services, and utilities than the proposed project. First, many of the businesses along Artesia Boulevard would be avoided thereby reducing air quality, noise, traffic, and potential spill/accident impacts on those businesses. Second, access impedance impacts on emergency service providers would be lessened since construction activities would not occur on Artesia Boulevard. In addition, there are significantly fewer utilities within the 100-foot ROW than located within Artesia Boulevard. Therefore, impacts to utilities resulting from construction or operation accidents would be less significant with this alternative than with the proposed project. Although impacts would be reduced with this alternative, Mitigation Measures S-1, S-2, S-3, S-4, S-5, SS-16, L-7, T-5, and T-13 still would be applicable.

C.10.8 ARTESIA ALTERNATIVE SEGMENT

This alternative would travel along a longer distance on Artesia Boulevard than the proposed project. Artesia Boulevard is a major thoroughfare and contains many businesses. Therefore, it is likely that there would be a minor increase in impacts to businesses along the pipeline route with the Artesia Alternative Segment. Impacts on public services and utilities would be similar to the proposed project. Mitigation Measures S-1, S-2, S-3, S-4, S-5, SS-16, L-7, T-5, and T-13 would be applicable to this alternative.

C.10.9 SHOEMAKER ALTERNATIVE SEGMENT

With the use of the Shoemaker Alternative Segment, construction and operation impacts on socioeconomics, public services, and utilities would be the same as the proposed project. Mitigation Measures S-1, S-2, S-3, S-4, S-5, SS-16, L-7, T-5, and T-13 would be applicable to this alternative.

C.10.10 NO PROJECT ALTERNATIVE

Under the No Project Alternative, the proposed project would not be built. Other forms of product transportation would have to be utilized increasingly as demand grows, including the use of existing pipeline capacity and truck transport. As described in Section B.9, if the proposed project is not built, and demand grows as predicted by SFPP, petroleum products would have to be provided to the Nevada, Arizona, and Inland Empire markets by other methods (either via other pipelines or trucks). Under this alternative, it is expected that all current socioeconomic, public services, and utility trends would continue in the portions of California, Nevada, and Arizona affected by the proposed project. The No Project Alternative would require no new construction, and as a result would not result in new disruption of public or utility services. However, the increased use of existing pipelines and trucking would result in more frequent accidents which would place an increased demand upon service providers in the study area of these transport methods.

C.10.11 MITIGATION MONITORING PROGRAM

Table C.10-7 on the following page sets out the mitigation measures proposed in this section and a program for monitoring them.

Table C.10-7 Mitigation Monitoring Program

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Location	Monitoring/ Reporting Action	Effectiveness Criteria	Responsible Agency	Timing
Construction noise, emissions, and traffic could disrupt businesses (Class II, III)	S-1 Include a business relations coordinator on the Applicant's project construction team; prepare a Business Impact Mitigation Plan; contact affected businesses. Design construction scheduling to minimize business impacts.	Entire pipeline route	Program shall be reviewed and approved by affected jurisdictions.	Avoid business disruption. Ensure acceptable cost recovery system for businesses.	CPUC, Los Angeles County and affected City Planning Departments	Prior to construction
	S-2 Applicant shall compensate any business disrupted, displaced or forced to relocate due to the construction or operation of the developer's project.		Permitting agency should verify that compensation has been paid.			Prior to and during construction
Use of water for dust suppression and hydrotesting could have an impact on water capacity (Class III)	S-3 [Deleted]					
Spill and/or clean-up could disrupt businesses (Class II)	S-4 [Deleted; incorporated into SS-16]					
Accident could cause damage to collocated utilities, resulting in fire, explosion or spill (Class I)	S-5 The Applicant shall set priorities for disaster repair efforts on utility lines and transportation networks.	Entire pipeline route	Assure that a comprehensive Utility Restoration Plan is prepared	Plans approved by Office of Emergency Service in Los Angeles County	CPUC, Los Angeles County and affected City Planning Departments	Prior to construction

C.10.12 REFERENCES

- Anderson, Jill. 1997. Personal communication with Susan Lee, Aspen. December 23.
- Aspen (Aspen Environmental Group). 1996. Final EIS/SEIR on the Pacific Pipeline Project. Prepared for the U.S. Forest Service, Angeles National Forest and California Public Utilities Commission. January.
- Brohard, Tom. 1997. Traffic Engineer. City of Bellflower. Data from City of Bellflower Subsurface Utility Maps. Personal communication. December 12.
- Carson, City of. 1981. City of Carson General Plan. Safety Element. Prepared by the Community Development Department. December 11 (revised).
- Census, Bureau of. 1994. *County and City Data Book; 1994*. Washington D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Cerritos, City of. 1997. City of Cerritos letter to CPUC. Santa Fe Pacific Pipeline EIR Scoping Comments. September 29.
- Cerritos, City of. 1988. Cerritos General Plan. May.
- CDOF (California Department of Finance). 1996. Demographic Research Unit. Report E-1, Total Population of California Cities. January.
- INTECH, Inc. 1992. *Inventory of Lifelines in the Cajon Pass, California*. Prepared for the Federal Emergency Management Agency, Washington, D.C. Submitted August 1991 to FEMA. FEMA 225, February.
- Long Beach, City of. 1975. City of Long Beach General Plan, Public Safety Element, prepared by the City of Long Beach Planning Department. May.
- Moreno, John. 1997. Public Works Manager. City of Paramount, Department of Public Works. Personal communication. November 12.
- Norwalk, City of. 1996. City of Norwalk General Plan. February 29.
- SCAG (Southern California Association of Governments). 1996. Regional Comprehensive Plan and Guide. March.
- SFPP (Santa Fe Pacific Pipeline Partners). 1997. Santa Fe Pacific Pipeline Partners Watson to Colton Expansion Project Proponent's Environmental Assessment and Amendment. Prepared for SFPP, L.P. by Woodward-Clyde Consultants. March and June.
- Thomas Guide, The. 1995. *Los Angeles/Orange Counties Street Guide and Directory*.